

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 5-22, 25-32, and 35-59 were pending. By virtue of this response, no claims are amended, and no claims are added. Therefore, claims 1-2, 5-22, 25-32, and 35-59 are presently pending. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-15, 19-22, 25-28, 31-32, 35-38, 41-45 and 49-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.: 6,704,727 issued to Alexander N. Kravets (hereinafter "Kravets").

In response, Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 1 recites, among other things "providing a plurality of candidate search terms related to said first search term... said relevancy scores are based in part on click information of a plurality of users and sales information based on purchase information of the plurality of users, the plurality of candidate search terms are at least organized in accordance with brands," (emphasis added).

In contrast, Kravets discloses determining relevant search results specific to the user performing the search using a user's "demographic profile" and "psychographic profile," for example. This is described in col. 5, lines 24-41, as follows:

The demographic profile preferably represents certain characteristics or features of a user that can be used to alter the search terms that are displayed to that user. The psychographic profile preferably represents certain preferences or tendencies of a user. For example, the psychographic profile can include the user's sensitivity to price an item such as a compact disc or the user's preference in music (i.e. rap music versus opera). (Emphasis added).

Therefore, even if the “demographic profile” or the “psychographic profile” of Kravets discloses “sales information based on purchase information,” the search of Kravets would yield search results based on relevancy specific for the user performing the search.

Kravets fails to disclose or suggest at least “providing a plurality of candidate search terms related to said first search term... said relevancy scores are based in part on click information of a plurality of users and sales information based on purchase information of the plurality of users” (emphasis added).

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim (MPEP 2131). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit claim 1 is allowable over Kravets. For at least the foregoing reasons given for claim 1, independent claims 21 and 31 are allowable over Kravets.

Claims 2, 5-8, 11-15, 19-20, 22, 25-28, 32, 35-38, 41-45, and 49-59 are allowable for at least the reason each depends on an allowable independent claim.

In sum, Kravets does not disclose or suggest providing candidate search terms, as required by the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify and provide a prior art reference disclosing the remaining elements of claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-15, 19-22, 25-28, 31-32, 35-38, 41-45 and 49-59 missing from Kravets.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-15, 19-22, 25-28, 31-32, 35-38, 41-45 and 49-59.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 9-10, 29-30 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kravets in view of U.S. Pub No.: 2003/0078915 issued to Surajit Chaudhuri et al. (hereinafter “Chaudhuri”).

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 9-10, 29-30, and 39-40, each of which is dependent from either base claim 1, 21, or 31, are allowable over Kravets in view of Chaudhuri. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 9-19, 29-30, and 39-40.

Claims 16-18 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kravets in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,701,314 issued to Joan Evelyn Conover et al. (hereinafter "Conover").

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 16-18 and 46-48, each of which is dependent from either base claim 1, 21, or 31, are allowable over Kravets in view of Conover. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 16-18, and 46-48.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No.: 03-1952** referencing **Docket No.: 324212003700**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: September 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By


Denise H. Wong

Registration No.: 59,622

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: 415.268.6221
Fax: 415.268.7522